UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,003	12/23/2005	Toshiharu Yokota	050786	1107
23850 7590 03/20/2007 ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW			EXAMINER	
			ZETTL, MARY E	
SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2875	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 03/20/2007		03/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<u> </u>	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/562,003	YOKOTA, TOSHIHARU			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mary Zettl	2875			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F	DEDI VIQ SET TO EVDIDE 2 Mi	ONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS			
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicat. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re ion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON y statute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	28 December 2006.				
,_	,—				
3) Since this application is in condition for a	, ·				
closed in accordance with the practice un	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	∍. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-27 is/are pending in the					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi	thdrawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-27 is/are rejected.	,				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement				
o) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Ex	•	- -			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 December 200</u>					
Applicant may not request that any objection					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the call to be seen as a second s					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		} 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority docu		an Bankina Na			
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docu3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of th					
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Experience.		received in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for		received.			
	·				
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· —	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	/	nformal Patent Application			

Art Unit: 2875

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 14-16 and 26 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 3-6 respectively.

Claims 24, and 25 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 12.

Also, claims 11, 19, and 21 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 9, 17, and 22, respectively.

When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138) in view of Murphy (US 819,702 A) and Gustavsson (DE 3217254 A).

Art Unit: 2875

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Kokubu et al. teach a refrigerator provided with a chamber lamp socket attached to the inside of a chamber, and a chamber lamp attached to and supported by the chamber lamp socket. Kokubu et al. further teaches the collar portion (1) being formed of a flexible material (paragraph 10, Detailed Description). Kokubu et al. further teach (figure 1) the collar portion coming into contact with the glass tube of the lamp. Kokubu et al. do not teach the presence of saw tooth shapes coming into direct contact with the glass tube of the chamber lamp. Murphy teaches the need for a mechanism for preventing the loosening of a bulb from a socket due to vibration (col. 1, lines 26-28). In order to prevent the loosening of the bulb, Murphy teaches a saw-toothed shape constituted by alternately forming gentle slopes and steep slopes to set a resistance in detaching the lamp to be larger than a resistance in attaching the lamp. At the time the invention was made, it would have well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that the lamps used in refrigerators are subject to mechanical vibrations. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the invention of Kokubu et al. such that a saw-toothed shape such as that taught by Murphy was used to prevent the lamp from coming loose due to vibrations. Murphy does not teach the saw-toothed shape being formed on the collar portion of the lamp socket and coming into direct contact with the glass tube of the Gustavsson (DE 3217254 A) teaches a lamp socket included a saw-toothed arrangement (13 and 14) on a flexible collar (1) and the saw-toothed arrangement coming into contact with the glass tube (12) of the lamp (Figure 2 and Abstract). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2875

art to have modified the invention of Kokubu et al. such that the a means for preventing the loosening of the lamp such as a saw tooth shape as that taught by Murphy was used and that this saw tooth shape gripped the glass tube of the lamp such as the saw tooth shape as taught by Gustavsson. One would have been motivated to make such a modification for the dual purposes of protecting the electrical components from moisture and preventing the bulb from becoming loose due to vibrations.

Regarding claims 3, 9, 11, 14 Kokubu et al. further teach an intermediate portion of the collar portion being provided with an annular protruding portion (1e) which is closely attached to the outer periphery of the glass tube of the chamber lamp.

Regarding claims 4, 15, 17, 19, Kokubu et al. further teach the use of a combustible refrigerant (Abstract).

Regarding claims 5, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, and 23, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have driven the chamber lamp with a commercial power supply voltage in order to avoid maintenance issues with other power supplies such as batteries.

2. Claims 6, 10, 12, 13, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138), Murphy (US 819,702 A), and Gustavsson (DE 3217254 A) as applied to claims 3, 9, 1, 7, and 14 above and further in view of Hawes et al. (US 3,915,328 A).

Regarding claims 6, 10, 12, 13, and 24-26, Kokubu et al. teach the collar being made of rubber or flexible plastics and being elastic. Kokubu et al. do not disclose

Art Unit: 2875

expressly the flexible plastic being a polyvinvl chloride resin material. Hawes et al. teaches a frame means for connecting structural members in a refrigerator or freezer (Abstract) including a collar made of polyvinyl chloride (col. 5, line 27). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious for Kokubu et al. to have utilized polyvinyl chloride for the flexible plastic as it was well known that polyvinyl chloride is a material widely used because it is inexpensive and easy to assemble.

3. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kokubu et al. (JP 2002-164138) in view of Hawes et al. (US 3,915,328 A).

Regarding claim 27, Kokubu et al. teach a refrigerator provided with a chamber lamp socket attached to the inside of a chamber, and a chamber lamp attached to and supported by the chamber lamp socket. Kokubu et al. further teaches the collar portion (1) being formed of a flexible material (paragraph 10, Detailed Description). Kokubu et al. further teach (figure 1) the collar portion coming into contact with the glass tube of the lamp. Kokubu et al. further teaches the lamp socket provided with unevenness on an inner surface thereof (1b and 1e). Kokubu et al. do not disclose expressly the flexible plastic being a polyvinvl chloride resin material. Hawes et al. teaches a frame means for connecting structural members in a refrigerator or freezer (Abstract) including a collar made of polyvinyl chloride (col. 5, line 27). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious for Kokubu et al. to have utilized polyvinyl chloride for the flexible plastic as it was well known that polyvinyl chloride is a material widely used because it is inexpensive and forms a good seal.

Art Unit: 2875

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Zettl whose telephone number is (571) 272-6007. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Renee Luebke can be reached on (571) 272-2009. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MZ

RENEEZUEBKE PRIMARY EXAMINER